

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-11, 13-15 and 18-20 are currently pending. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13 and 15 have been amended. Claims 12, 16 and 17 have been cancelled and new claims 18-20 have been submitted herewith.

Claims 1-11, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly clearly anticipated by Tanner et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,445,150 B1).

Claim 1 has been amended to provide more specific coverage of the displayed representation of a model railroad layout. More specifically, claim 1 recites a software program stored on a computer-readable medium for monitoring and controlling a model railroad, said software program operable to perform the steps of: displaying a representation of said model railroad layout on a display, wherein a first portion of said model railroad layout is displayed using a first visual characteristic and a second portion of said model railroad layout is displayed using a second visual characteristic, wherein said first portion is selected to allow train movement thereon, and wherein said second portion is deselected to prevent train movement thereon; and editing said representation of said model railroad layout. Among other things, this claimed combination enables a display of the model railroad layout, within which a specific visual showing is provided as to where the train currently can run and currently cannot run.

Tanner, by way of contrast, provides only a vague description of the displayed representation of a model railroad (see, e.g., col 2 lines 6-10, and col 5 lines 11-27 of Tanner). Tanner does not disclose any visual mechanism for segregating

selected/deselected portions of a model train layout. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claim 1 combination is not clearly anticipated by Tanner and, therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Tanner are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly clearly anticipated by Tanner et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,445,150 B1). It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claim from which they depend.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as also being allegedly clearly anticipated by Tanner et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,445,150 B1). Claim 11 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 12 and 16. More specifically an interface unit operable to translate a command received from a computer into a motor control command for controlling at least one element within a model railroad system, said interface comprising: a plurality of addressable units for receiving address information and data information within said command, wherein one of said plurality of addressable units that corresponds to said address information within said command translates said data information into said motor control command and outputs said motor control command, wherein said plurality of addressable units include a set of decoders and a plurality of addressable registers, and wherein said command includes three address bits, four group bits and one data bit.

Tanner discloses an interface unit but does not use a plurality of addressable registers. Additionally the command in Tanner is a 4-bit addressing scheme able to address 16 devices (col 14 lines 44-45) as compared to Applicant's 8-bit addressing scheme which is able to address up to 128 devices. It is respectfully suggested that Tanner nowhere teaches or suggests Applicant's claim 11 combination as amended.

Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Tanner are respectfully requested.

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly clearly anticipated by Tanner et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,445,150 B1). It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 11 from which they depend. Additionally dependent claims 14 and 15 comprise a triac and a coil latching relay, respectively, neither of which is disclosed by Tanner. Applicant respectfully suggests that Tanner nowhere teaches or suggests these claimed features. Accordingly reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Tanner is respectfully requested.

New claims 18-20 have been added by way of this response in order to provide additional claim coverage for the present invention. Dependent claim 18 refers to an exemplary embodiment of the editing function of the graphical user interface. Dependent claim 19 refers to an exemplary embodiment of the model railroad display. Independent claim 20 refers to an exemplary embodiment of a model railroad system. It is respectfully submitted that the features found in these claims are also not taught or suggested by Tanner.

All of the objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this response or the application in general, she or he is invited to contact the undersigned at (540) 361-1863.

Respectfully submitted,

POTOMAC PATENT GROUP PLLC

By: 

Steven M. duBois

Registration No. 35,023

Date: April 20, 2005

Potomac Patent Group, PLLC
P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, VA 22404
(540) 361-1863